4 8.
HQ 759 A1

A Review of Twenty-five Years

THE NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE FAMILY

Annual Report for 1905

THE

National League for the Protection of the Family.

President.

Hon. NATHANIEL SHIPMAN, LL.D., Hartford, Conn.

Vice-Presidents.

Rt. Rev. WILLIAM LAWRENCE, D.D., LL.D., Boston.
Hon. SETH LOW, LL.D., New York.

Corresponding Secretary.

Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale.

Recording Secretary.

Rev. C. H. SPALDING, D.D., Cambridge.

Treasurer.

WOLCOTT H. JOHNSON, Care of C. F. Hovey & Co., Boston.

Executive Committee.

Pres. W. E. HUNTINGTON, Ph.D., LL.D., Newton Centre.
Pres. GEORGE HARRIS, D.D., LL.D., Amherst.
Prof. FRANCIS G. PEABODY, D.D., Cambridge.
Prof. ALBION W. SMALL, Ph.D., LL.D., Chicago.
Rev. DANIEL MERRIMAN, D.D., Worcester.
Rev. WILLIAM H. COBB, D.D., Newton Centre.
EVERETT O. FISK, Esq., Boston.
FRANK GAYLORD COOK, Esq., Cambridge.
Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale.

REPORT

OF THE

National League for the Protection of the Family

FOR THE

Year Ending December 31, 1905

BOSTON:
THE EVERETT PRESS COMPANY, PRINTERS,
74 India Street.
1906

Notices.

Only a few of our preceding Reports are in print. But many of them can be found in libraries. Of our publications only a small tract on "The Pastor and the Home," a paper on the Home Department of the Sunday School, a Report of the National Council of the Congregational Churches on "The Family," and "A Summary of the Divorce Legislation of Twenty Years" are now in print. These can be sent on application to the Corresponding Secretary. A paper read at the Congress of Arts and Science in St. Louis on "The Problem of the Family" will be reprinted soon and can be sent to any who ask for it.

The United States Report of 1889 on Marriage and Divorce is out of print. But Congress has ordered that report to be brought down to date by the Census Office. But it will be several months and probably a year before the report can be made and printed. Meanwhile we can supply a very few copies of our abstract of the statistics of the Report of 1889 and a leaflet giving a summary of the latest statistics of Divorce from our report of 1903.

Attention is called to what is said in the Report this year on an endowment. We shall need a large increase of new contributors this year, as we have had an unusual number of losses by death and in other ways. New calls for work require more money. Will not every one interested in the Family make a place for a contribution? All money given to aid the Home is an aid to every other object that depends on a good home.

Associate annual membership is invited from those who cannot give large sums. The fee is Five Dollars, and there is no obligation to continue the membership unless one chooses. Contributions should be sent to Mr. Wolcott H. Johnson, Treasurer, care of C. F. Hovey & Co., Boston, or may be sent directly to Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D., Corresponding Secretary, 113 Hancock Street, Auburndale, Mass., to whom all correspondence should be addressed.

Minutes.

The annual meeting of the National League for the Protection of the Family was held in the Diocesan House, No. 1 Joy Street, Boston, on Friday, Jan. 26, 1906, at 2.30 P.M.

The meeting was called to order by Rev. S. W. Dike, LL.D., the Corresponding Secretary, and Rev. W. H. Cobb, D.D., was chosen to preside. The records of the last annual meeting were read by the Recording Secretary. Dr. Dike read letters from Vice-President Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., and President M. H. Buckham, D.D.

The annual report of the Treasurer, Mr. Wolcott H. Johnson, was presented, and referred to Mr. W. B. Herrick as Auditor. The report showed that the League had reached its twenty-fifth anniversary free from debt. Dr. Dike reported for the Executive Committee the effort to clear up the debt. Dr. Dike read from his annual report as Corresponding Secretary. It was voted to accept the report, and it was ordered printed and distributed under the direction of Dr. Dike.

Voted to adjourn.

C. H. SPALDING,
Recording Secretary

Report of Corresponding Secretary.

THE more significant events of the year are the special message of President Roosevelt asking that the Marriage and Divorce Report of 1889 be brought down to date and the provision of Congress for the work; the Pennsylvania plan for a Conference of State Commissions in Washington next month — February 19–26 — to draft a Uniform Divorce Law; some interesting State legislation on Divorce; sessions of the Inter-church Committee on Marriage and Divorce; and the large place given to the Home in the meeting of the Religious Education Association. We refer to these later.

OUR TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY.

As it is twenty-five years the twenty-fourth of January since we first met for organization, we make this report an outline of history, necessarily brief, and using much material from some of our Annual Reports.

The League was first organized as "The New England Divorce Reform League," Jan. 24, 1881. The Rev. George A. Jackson, then of Swampscott, conceived the idea of bringing together in a society committees and others interested. These committees had been at work in Connecticut and Vermont since 1878, and a few months in Massachusetts, with some aid from New Hampshire. A lecture by the present Corresponding Secretary had been given that day in the Boston Monday Lectureship,— which was printed in full in some of the newspapers, and later in the volume of "Monday Lectures" for that winter,— on "Facts as to Divorce in New England." He had been writing editorially on the subject in *The Vermont Chronicle* for three years. Ex-President Woolsey of Yale, who had published a learned book on the subject in 1869, was its first President. The Rt. Rev. B. H. Paddock, President Hovey of the Newton Theological Seminary, the Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, and Judge Shipman have succeeded to the office. Mr. W. G. Benedict was Treasurer until his death, in 1904, when Mr. Wolcott H. Johnson became his successor. It has had but one Corresponding Secretary, and the Rev. C. H. Spalding, D.D., has for many years been its Recording Secretary.

The Condition in 1881.

Very little had been done about divorce in this country, beyond a discussion in Connecticut in 1860–66. Little was made of the relation of divorce to the Family. The ecclesiastical and legal writing on the subject treated it by itself. One law-book was entitled "The Law of the Domestic Relations." But the Family was hardly mentioned by most. Prophetic minds, like Bushnell and Mulford here and Maurice in England, had clearly pointed to the Family. President Woolsey had given the Family attention in his lectures at Yale. But nothing else had been done in our educational institutions. There were no lectures then on Social Science or Sociology. Indeed, the word "sociology" was scarcely heard except in connection with the writings of Herbert Spencer. Maine, Morgan, and Tylor were read somewhat, but largely for their archæological work. Their significance on the Family as a modern problem was not much noticed. There was no book in the language with the simple title of "The Family." The only one approaching it was on purely traditional lines. Property was beginning to be a problem of importance, but its relation to the Family was hardly mentioned.

In the Church a decline of instruction in the Home had been going on with the rise of the Sunday school, or perhaps it had ceased to get much attention; for all the century the Church had been devising and using societies for its work more and more, culminating in the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor, organized two weeks after the League.

All these had done little directly for the Home. Its gain from them was almost wholly incidental. If the Home did not stand absolutely still as an institution, it certainly got too little direct attention. And the same tendency away from the Home towards collective activity existed in the public school, the factory, and in social reform. The motto "For the Home" was frequent, but the real effort was to reach people through collective associations.

The New Point of View.

The lecture of the day had pointed, through the evils of divorce, unchastity, polygamy, and the like, to the Family as the real problem, and to the apparent trend of Western civilization as the underlying explanation of the situation. But while the force of this was felt, the local restrictions of our Connecticut friends to Divorce Reform led to the adoption of the narrower title for the new society. The proposition to substitute the term "Family" for "Divorce" the next year failed, but was unanimously adopted in 1897, the term "National" having been adopted in 1885. It has throughout been consistent with this broader position, and held that the Family was the real question, and that that in turn was a part of the social question as a whole.

Principles and Method of Work.

Catholicity has always been its spirit. The League has aimed to afford a channel of work for all who desire an improvement in the conditions of the Family, whatever their views as to disputed points might be. It has never had the slightest internal dissension. It has not undertaken to do great things by itself. It has never held a mass-meeting. It has never formulated a set of proposed laws for general adoption. It has not looked on legal reform or ecclesiastical action as by themselves adequate. The Home is the social cell and its problems are therefore as many and as intricate as those of society.

For these reasons the League has sought to touch and inspire rather than to do all by itself. The more we could get others — the churches, societies, schools, citizens, as such — to do the work, the better. More work would thus be done, and at less cost of money. The work the people do is thus more likely to stay done.

We have not appealed much to mere sentiment. Statistics from official sources, comparative and historical study, the sociological method by ourselves, and especially so far as possible by scholars in educational institutions, lectures at centres of influence, articles in the best periodicals, and correspondence have been our chief reliance. Popular addresses have been used, but less of late years, because the novelty of the subject is now less and other means are more useful. Still, we welcome to some extent such opportunities.

A Statistical Basis.

Only four States and two or three foreign countries gave statistics on divorce when the Secretary began his study, in 1877. In 1882 Signor Bodio, the Italian statistician, published a small pamphlet on "Divorce in Europe." This enlarged the field a little. The next year M. Bertillon issued a little pamphlet adding somewhat to our knowledge. We had the year before secured from Governor Long a recommendation which led to the provision made then for annual statistics in Massachusetts, following those that had already been collected at our suggestion by Hon. Carroll D. Wright. Most of the United States and Europe were still a blank on the subject. Crude notions prevailed. Southerners denied that divorce prevailed to any extent in their part of the country. Intemperance was thought by many to lie at the bottom of the evil. The feeling was general that nine tenths of the divorces were obtained through migration to a foreign State for the purpose. Nothing but a Constitutional amendment would meet this last evil. The Secretary had seen, as he thought, that the reverse of the latter opinion was more nearly correct. A comprehensive investigation for the entire country seemed desirable.

So he proposed it in 1883. Petitions from a few men of standing were sent to Congress and the matter was pressed until we succeeded, in 1887, some of the religious bodies, especially the General Convention of the Episcopal Church, giving important aid. The Secretary of the League was asked to assist in planning and executing the work. The results appeared in a volume of 1,074 pages from the Department of Labor, the Hon. Carroll D. Wright, Commissioner, in 1899. A number of editions have been issued and exhausted. It became the standard authority on the subject for the world, covering as it did all available figures here and in Europe.

After another effort of three years the League secured, getting a special message from President Roosevelt calling for it, provision to bring the Report of 1889 down to date. The work will soon be taken up, and then pushed as fast as possible, This, with the Report of 1889, will give the data for a study of the marriage and divorce statistics and the changes in the laws for nearly forty years.

The number of States making annual collection of divorce statistics has increased from four to ten, California having been added to the list the last year. England and Wales, the German Empire, Australia, New Zealand, and Japan have also adopted annual reports. By request the Secretary sent a paper to the International Statistical Association in 1893, on "The Condition and Needs of Statistics of Divorce." He contributed discussions of statistics and statistical methods on divorce to *The Political Science Quarterly*, the American Statistical Association, *The Andover Review*, and to newspapers. Professor Willcox of Cornell University also contributed two articles to *The Political Science Quarterly* on the subject. In 1883 the Department of State acted to some extent on our suggestion and made inquiry into the moral conditions of immigrants. We also contributed to the press statistics and discussions of illegitimacy, crime, and pauperism, and pointed out the limitations of the statistical method.

Educational Work.

There was great need of a better understanding of the causes and social relations of divorce and other domestic evils. Following conventional lines of biblical interpretation and the ordinary method of treating the history of divorce did not seem to meet the needs of the case. The Monday Lecture already referred to had pointed to the need. An article was therefore printed in *The Princeton Review* for March, 1884, showing that our condition in regard to divorce was the outcome of the social movement of several centuries in Europe and America. This was followed by a paper in *Christian Thought*, in December, 1885, on "The Family in the History of Christianity," which pointed to the circum-

stances which led the early Church, in its treatment of divorce, celibacy, and chastity, to deal with these matters separately, and not in their relations to the Family as an institution. Another paper in *The Andover Review* for December, 1893, on "The Theory of the Marriage Tie," tried to show that in the divorce question we raise essentially the same point as that which was at issue in our Civil War concerning the relation of the States to the Union. These papers were thought to have broken new ground in the treatment of the subject and to open the wider field to view.

Another New Departure.

The historical study of the Family had of course shown its intimate connection with communal groups of society. The Family and the communal form of life had grown up as closely related as cell and tissue in the human body. The study of the Family had necessarily carried with it the study of the community. Observation and pastoral experience had led to much reflection on the relation of the communal and domestic organization of country towns. The problems of the country towns thus came to be seen in comparison with their antecedent problems in earlier society. This view found warm support at Johns Hopkins, where the study of early communal societies had then begun, and at Andover, where Professor Tucker was beginning his study of city evangelization. Four articles were published in *The Andover Review*, beginning in August, 1884, one of them being given to the part of the Family in the problem, a subject which had then interested the writer for several years. This brought the Family to the front in the treatment of the problems of the Church. Many others took up the subject of the country town and its related theme of city evangelization, out of which the settlement plan grew.

The point of the discussion turned on the question, Have we not a work to do to bring the Family into its rightful place as a religious institution? In early society it was emphatically the chief religious institution. Have we not in modern times overshot the mark and done too much, relatively, through congregations and too little in homes? Have we fed these springs of society with due care? Do we not need to discover the true place of the Home in the work of the Church and see that it has it?

This question runs deep, and contrary to the movement of the Church for at least a century; for the churches have concentrated their attention for a century or more, without much thought of the tendency, on the invention and use of societies or communal organizations for doing their work, and have relatively neglected the use and study of the Home for religious ends. A redistribution of religious forces seemed necessary, but how to begin was a serious and not an easy question to answer.

The Home Department of the Sunday School.

The need of something practical to show people the real need and what could be done in this direction pressed on the mind a long time. The easiest plan seemed to be to get something that would show the Church that there is a field for its coöperation with the Home. The idea of taking the Sunday school came to mind. Here are people shut out of the school except when conditions favor their attendance. Why not have a Home Department for such? So in a busy time a few minutes were taken to outline the plan in a short letter printed in *The Vermont Chronicle* Jan. 9, 1885. This, with further suggestions, was sent to Dr. A. E. Dunning, then Secretary of the Congregational Sunday School and Publishing Society, and together we put the plan into practical shape. Its fundamental idea was to get those who could not for any reason attend the Sunday school to study the lesson at home, in what we called the Home Department, without an outside teacher and under such care as the school should provide.

After a year or two of our direct activity and care for the new plan the claim that the Home Department was the direct outgrowth of an earlier Home Class scheme, which was for children with a teacher, and without any use of the Home idea except as a popular term and a place for gathering the children of neighboring families, was made, and we were practically excluded from the counsels of the friends of the plan, and the Home idea made little of, to the great loss for a time of the success that was due and expected.

Two things have corrected the error. The simplicity and great power of adaptability in the original Home Department gradually led to the sloughing off of the foreign features grafted upon it, and the system gradually returned to its original features. And the Congregational Sunday School and Publication Society, which had issued in 1895 an elaborate defence of the Home Class system as the original plan, felt compelled under pressure to give the whole claim of their book a thorough investigation. This was begun more than two years ago. The Directors have now notified us that they find that we were not only the originators of the plan, but that to-day it retains more of the original features than those of others who have helped develop it. It is hoped that they will soon make the public statement that is due to all concerned. The whole affair is a sad illustration of the way that a wrong may creep into a religious society in the interests of dull or designing men.

The most important point in the matter for us is the probable fact that the religious world will now see in the success of the Home Department its message on the possibilities of the Home as an undeveloped part of the forces of the Church. It is possible that we may yet see a study of the present heterogeneous collection of societies in some of our churches,

with a view to a redistribution of Christian effort in more scientific and practical ways. When this comes about we may be sure the Home will get more attention.

Other Educational Work.

Besides the articles already noted, the Secretary has made many contributions to the press, largely on the Family. In all, his articles in reviews, magazines, and the like cover some thirty-five titles. One on "Sociology in the Higher Education of Women" called for the training of young women in sociology and the Family. This appeared in *The Atlantic Monthly* for November, 1892, and attracted much attention at the time.

We have given addresses and lectures, sometimes a course of lectures, in more than sixty higher educational institutions, and in some of these repeatedly. Had money for expenses been at our disposal, much more would have been done through acceptance of the invitations that have come to us from the Pacific Coast and the South. Nothing has been more useful; for out of the young men thus reached have come many teachers and others who have said that they had their interest in the Family as a study and practical question awakened by them. If we are doing less of this work of late, it is because our means for travel are still more limited, and in many institutions the professors themselves are doing the work.

Correspondence.

This has been a large means of influence. Legislators, editors, teachers, writers, and ministers have constantly sought aid in this way. Several debates in universities and law schools have been carried on from aid received in this way. Some of these have been extremely interesting for their research and able conduct of discussion. Professors preparing courses in Social Science have often sought our aid and suggestions. Correspondence has sometimes extended to foreign countries. Missionaries write us. Such names as those of Gladstone, Bryce, Sir Alfred Stephen, Premier and Chief Justice of New South Wales, and professors in European universities may be named in this connection.

Legislation.

We have always recognized the truth that successful legislation rests on public sentiment. Our educational work has been valuable for this, as well as for other reasons. Indeed, we think the present demand for legislation is in no small degree due to our educational work.

But as a League we have had no pet measures of our own. To devise such must be the work of private citizens and trained law-makers. We have, however, secured statistics through legislative action, and encouraged in every way the movement for uniform laws through the State

Commissions as the way to attack that problem at the outset, if not finally.

But we have tried to aid all who seek improvement, with information and suggestions as these have been desired. We have advised those who seek information to enlist as many of good standing in various callings in the work as possible; to study carefully the situation; attack the worst features of the laws that can be most hopefully assailed, and with carefully prepared measures that are likely to stand the test of experience. We will give you information, we say, but it is best that you do the work. In this way legislation rests on a local sentiment that will sustain it, and the variety of methods brought out is instructive, and a natural trend toward uniformity is created.

The Divorce Legislation of the Last Twenty Years.

From Prof. G. E. Howard's great work on "The History of Matrimonial Institutions," published in 1904, which all students of the subject should see, and from other sources, we summarize the divorce legislation of the last twenty-one years, good and bad alike. Most of this was given in our report of last year.

The term of residence before divorce has been raised from ninety days in the Dakotas and Oklahoma, and from six months in Arizona, California, and Georgia, to one year; except that in South Dakota it is six months unless the defendant is a non-resident. New Jersey requires three years if the offence is adultery, and Virginia one year, in the county where one of the parties lives. Delaware forbids divorce to all non-residents if the cause is not a legal cause in the State whence they came. Several States have provided for fuller notice to non-resident defendants, and some have made stricter regulations regarding domicile. In only one State have conditions to parties coming into the State for divorce been made easier. Delaware has put the jurisdiction of divorce in the courts instead of in the Legislature. Indiana, New Jersey, and Rhode Island have provided for limited divorces.

Arizona has abolished its "omnibus" clause. Idaho, Utah, and Washington have added insanity to their legal causes. Florida did so, but has repealed it, as have Arkansas and North Dakota. The District of Columbia — also North Carolina, the last year — have reduced the grounds of divorce to one. Colorado has added felony, and Pennsylvania has put more careful restrictions on divorce for crime. A limited divorce in Louisiana can now be made absolute after one year. This kind of divorce by conversion, as it is called, is the rule in Holland and in France, but the term is there five years.

Fourteen States have put restrictions on the remarriage of divorced persons, New York and Illinois having done this the last year. This has

been done in two ways. By one all decrees are made *nisi*, and are operative only after six months or a year, generally the latter period, except in New York, where the term is only three months. By the other it is effected by a positive prohibition of remarriage for one or two years, and Illinois enforces the rule by making the remarriage invalidate the divorce.

Seven States have made advertising to procure divorces illegal, and in six the State's attorney must defend some or all cases. Colorado and Pennsylvania now require the insertion of the date and cause of the divorce in the license of all parties remarrying, while Connecticut and Massachusetts require the statement of the fact of divorce in the new marriage certificate.

The New England States have perfected their systems of official divorce statistics, New Hampshire carrying the work back to 1858, and Maine beginning it. Michigan has now an excellent system, and California has just provided one. Ohio and Indiana also report annually.

Congress enacted a uniform marriage law for all the Territories, and has made the term of residence one year for them all. This legislation, it will be seen, is almost invariably in the right direction.

Marriage Legislation.

We cannot go into details, but there has been a marked improvement, noticeably in the far West. New Jersey and Wisconsin have introduced systems of marriage license for the first time, thus cutting out their "Gretna Greens." New Hampshire almost alone has taken a step backward by the repeal of its requirement of five days' notice of intention of marriage from non-residents. Apparently Rhode Island and one or two other States need this restriction.

Uniform Legislation.

Twenty-five years ago nearly everybody, except President Woolsey, was looking to an amendment of the Constitution of the United States as the only way to uniform divorce laws. Nobody then thought of a uniform marriage law. The common opinion then was that nine tenths of all the divorces in the country were due to migration for the purpose. The Secretary of the League held the contrary opinion, and saw that uniformity might be secured at the cost of an actual increase of divorces in the country as a whole. But the only safe way to decide the question was on a basis of the facts. This need was the origin of the movement for statistics already noted. The result justified the course; for out of all the divorces whose place of marriage was known, 80.1 per cent had been married in the State where they had been divorced, though 22 and 23 per cent of the people were not living in the State of their birth, and on the average 9.17 years had elapsed between marriage and divorce. This

justified our distrust of Constitutional amendment as a means of reducing the number of divorces.

State Commissions on Uniformity.

We then called the attention of the American Bar Association to the matter in 1889, in a letter to its president, the Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, also at the time of our own Executive Committee, and a special committee, to which the action of the Bar Association had looked earlier, was appointed. About the same time some gentlemen in New York had independently secured from the State Legislature a commission to co-operate with similar commissions from other States to secure uniformity on a variety of subjects, including marriage and divorce. The Secretary of the League brought these parties together at Saratoga in August, 1889, publishing an article in *The Arena*, in September, designed to aid the movement. This article met the approval of those interested and was referred to the next year in the report of the special committee of the Bar Association as, in connection with Mr. W. L. Snyder's book on "The Geography of Marriage," having been conclusive against Constitutional amendment. All agreed that the first thing to do was to press the New York plan for State Commissions, and we all coöperated in the effort to get commissions appointed. These came slowly; but they have reached at least thirty-five in number, and have drafted a proposed law for uniform procedure in divorce cases, it being found difficult or unwise to meddle with the statutory grounds at present.

Other and easier subjects were necessarily taken up first. Some of these have been most successfully handled, thirty States having already enacted a uniform Negotiable Bills Act. But the Divorce Bill has been withheld for further improvement.

Another Movement for Uniformity.

Last year a new turn was given to the movement by an entirely independent step in Pennsylvania. This State has appointed three Commissioners and the Governor to meet in Washington similar commissions from other States to study the subject of divorce alone, and, if practicable, draft a uniform law to be adopted by the several States of the Union. Though started in the interests of local parties, this movement was immediately taken on to broad ground; for Governor Pennypacker appointed the members of the old Commissions on Uniformity to serve on the new commission, and other States have largely followed his lead in this respect. Thirty States at last accounts had appointed commissioners, and others have promised to do so. The meeting is to be held in Washington February 19–26. Some eminent clergymen are among the commissioners and may add an element of usefulness to a body

mainly composed of lawyers only. The presence of many of the experienced members of the old State Commissions, and the concentration on the one subject of divorce, should make the meeting one of much interest. Even the old movement was said at the time to be the most important juridical effort since the adoption of the Constitution.

International Uniformity.

The probable need of some international uniformity on marriage and divorce law in the future has led us from time to time to note the movements of foreign law. There is a tendency in this direction. Within the period of twenty-five years some important changes have occurred in other countries. France had a new divorce law in 1884. Japan has for the first time established a system of family law, mainly in the line of German law. Germany established a uniform divorce law recently, which is reducing divorces. Australia has made Constitutional provision for such a law. The German marriage and divorce laws are conceived as parts of a consistent system of family law, since law there is regarded as the science of relations rather than of rights. Perhaps what Professor Howard says of the changes in the divorce laws of the United States in the last twenty years may be said of the civilized world. He says, "Within this period the foundation of what may sometime become a common and effective code for the whole Union has been slowly laid."

The Churches, and Their Part in the Work.

The churches have become increasingly awake to the evils relating to marriage and divorce, but most of them at first looked to the condition of the laws of the State, rather than to any broader view of the Family, as a direct concern of their own. But progress has been made. We pointed long ago to the need of comity between churches and ministers, as well as between States, and the need of uniformity of ecclesiastical as well as of political action. This idea has gained recognition. The Protestant Episcopal Church and the National Council of Congregational Churches took action at the same time, and an "Inter-church Committee," now representing fourteen Protestant churches, has been organized to secure concerted action regarding marriage and divorce. It has held three or four meetings, two the last year, and seems likely to exert a wholesome influence. For information regarding its plans and work, readers should write the Secretary, the Rev. W. H. Roberts, D.D., Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Penn.

We have pressed in various ways the idea already treated that the churches should study the possibility of a larger use of the Home as a religious force of great importance. The success of the Home Depart-

ment of the Sunday School will lead to further interest in the idea. The Congregational National Council has a special committee to report in 1907 on the work of the Home in all directions. It is hoped that other churches will in time take hold of this subject in earnest.

The Home, and Other Social Institutions.

We have long urged attention to the place of the Home in public education and in economic interests and philanthropy. We have pointed to the Home as one of the greatest of educational institutions, especially in its work on character, which is more and more recognized as the great aim in all general education. But the Church is too often interested in the more conventional moralities, while the School better understands real morality, and the way to secure it. We have urged a much closer and more intelligent cooperation between the Home and the Church and the School as a pressing problem. The trend in this direction among educators is becoming clearer. The new Religious Education Association is doing much to help it on. The large part that papers and discussions regarding the Home had in the last meeting of the Association is most encouraging.

Though the very term "economics" means law of the Home, the science has been slow to take the Home into its consideration, and the business world has been still more tardy in its recognition of dependence on good homes for its highest prosperity. But there has been improvement in the respect of economics. Schools of Household Economics, as they are sometimes pleonastically called, are becoming common, and are growing fast in favor. But the man of business still puts money into every other philanthropic effort but that in behalf of the Home, the foundation of all.

In philanthropy there is more recognition of the Home. Those who deal with poverty, pauperism, crime, and vice are quite alive to the Home as a great factor in their problems.

The Low Birth-rate of the Country.

At the beginning of our work we pointed to the decline in the birth-rate of the so-called native stock, and have frequently called attention to it since. While seeing that quality as well as numbers is an element of importance, we have urged our people not to shut their eyes to the evil and its far-reaching consequences. We pointed to the shameful and criminal practices which secure small families, and collected and published statistics regarding illegitimacy in Europe, those for this country being almost entirely lacking. Early in the period Dr. Nathan Allen and later Dr. George Engelmann did good service in this field. President Roosevelt's frequent references to the subject and the terrible fate of a

young woman in Boston have turned attention to it anew; but much instruction is needed on it.

Summary Observations.

We have only outlined our aims, methods, and work for the period. Our Annual Reports, first published in 1885, the Government Report of 1889 on Marriage and Divorce, and the various papers of the Secretary and others, and files of correspondence, must be consulted for the rest.

It will be seen that we have tried to work broadly and on sound lines, and for the future rather than for immediate results. We have treated the Home and communal social forms as the two centres of thought and effort. That here in America we are on the advance line of the great social movement and without the conserving influence of such a Constitutional recognition of the Family as that which, for example, England has through the Throne, the House of Lords, and its system of inheritance, makes it all the more imperative that we should be alive to the situation. The question was not raised a moment too soon. But let us remember that we do not need to get back to some Golden Age in the past so much as to move forward to the solid ground of the future. No small part of the problems of human society are wrapped up in those of the Family. There is and will be need of a society far larger than ours has yet been to meet the conditions.

Finances and Needs.

The League did not get money enough to justify a salaried Secretary until September, 1882, and then in three years he was, at his own request, paid only $1,050, $900, and $1,200. In spite of this, a debt accumulated of over $1,200 in 1887. This was paid off the next two years, and the salary put at $2,000. This later was made $1,800. But another debt came, which, five years ago, was nearly paid off by the extra gifts of regular contributors. And now some twenty or more of this same class have enabled us to complete this year free of all past obligations. No society ever had better friends than the few who have kept the work alive from year to year. We now again ask others to make some sacrifices in its support.

An Endowment Needed.

This need has long been felt, and the League was incorporated under the laws of Connecticut, and the fact stated annually on a page of our cover, to which we call attention. But it should be endowed immediately. The present Secretary cannot continue his service many years

longer at the utmost. He would like to see the League put on a sound financial basis, and its future usefulness insured thereby.

Will not some far-seeing man or woman provide wholly or in part for this endowment immediately? Into what college or library can $100,000 be put that would yield better returns to the country than that sum used to endow this or some other society that should forever be doing work to protect and develop the Home in the United States? With the income of such a sum for fundamental expenses the public would be left free to provide for the material and general work. Will not thoughtful people give this matter serious attention?

Something Each Year From Every One.

But every well-ordered system of annual benevolences should have a place in it for some money for the direct interests of the Home. That is not a wise method which gives to foreign and home missions, and to the rescue of people from the results of bad home life, and yet does nothing to reach and improve the homes from which ministers, missionaries, money, as well as the poor and vicious, come. There is not an interest that does not depend on good homes for its best men and women and for its money. Homes broken up by divorce and impaired by low standards of life are not good sources of supply either of men or money to our churches and benevolent societies. If it were necessary it would pay most of our benevolent societies each year to turn over a per cent of their receipts to a society like the League.

Recognition of Our Work.

This has come in many ways. The Secretary has been made a member of learned societies, often reading papers before them, of the Sociological Group, and the Committee of Fifty on the Drink Problem, and of the Congress of Arts and Science at St. Louis in 1904, where he read a paper to be issued in the Proceedings and reprinted this year for the League.

The St. Louis Exposition awarded the exhibit of the League a Gold Medal, and the Lewis and Clark Exposition has done the same.

Respectfully submitted,

SAMUEL W. DIKE,
Corresponding Secretary.

Treasurer's Report.

RECEIPTS		$2,552 07
EXPENDITURES		
Express, Telephone, etc.	$11 45	
Postage	45 30	
Stationery	20 55	
Printing	100 60	
Travelling	148 09	
Advertising	3 00	
Rent	50 00	
Salary, Rev. Samuel W. Dike, Secretary	1,800 00	
Applied to deficit as shown by books Jan. 1, 1905	373 08	
		$2,552 07

WOLCOTT H. JOHNSON, *Treasurer.*

JAN. 27, 1906

I have this day examined the Treasury accounts and find the same to be correct.

W. B. HERRICK, *Auditor.*

CONTRIBUTIONS.

Jan.	2.	Hon. Seth Low, LL.D., New York, N. Y.	$50 00	
	14.	Hon. Nathaniel Shipman, LL.D., Hartford, Conn.	25 00	
	17.	Miss M. Josephine Allen, Boston	10 00	
	17.	President W. E. Huntington, LL.D., Newton Centre	5 00	
	17.	Christ Church, Hartford, Conn.	10 00	
	20.	Frank Gaylord Cook, Cambridge	2 00	
	20.	Col. Jacob L. Greene, Hartford, Conn.	35 00	
	20.	St. Bartholomew's Church, New York, N. Y.	50 00	
		Received in January		$187 00
Feb.	4.	Mrs. William E. Dodge, New York, N. Y.	$100 00	
	4.	Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., LL.D., Boston	25 00	
	10.	James C. Braman, Auburndale	10 00	
	10.	State Street Church, Portland, Me.	4 98	
	10.	Hon. Arthur T. Lyman, Boston	5 00	
	12.	Rt. Rev. W. H. Hare, D.D., Sioux Falls, S. D.	5 00	
	12.	Rev. Thomas W. Thompson, Worcester	5 00	
	12.	Rev. Charles F. Dole, Jamaica Plain	5 00	
	13.	Robert C. Ogden, New York, N. Y.	25 00	

Feb.	13.	Mrs. Charlotte F. Blackman, Waterbury, Conn.	$10 00	
	14.	Rev. Francis Goodwin, D.D., Hartford, Conn.	20 00	
	14.	Rev. Joshua Coit, Winchester	2 00	
	15.	Rev. William P. Alcott, Boxford	2 00	
	15.	Pres. Edward M. Gallaudet, LL.D., Washington, D.C.	10 00	
	17.	Rt. Rev. Daniel S. Tuttle, D.D., LL.D., St. Louis, Mo.	5 00	
	17.	St. Agnes' Chapel, New York, N.Y.	10 00	
	18.	Prof. Henry W. Farnham, R.P.D., New Haven, Conn.	25 00	
	18.	Rt. Rev. Chauncey B. Brewster, D.D., Hartford, Conn.	3 00	
	18.	Rt. Rev. William Crosswell Doane, D.D., LL.D., Albany, N. Y.	5 00	
	21.	Mrs. John S. Mitchell, Waterbury, Conn.	50 00	
	22.	Rt. Rev. A. C. A. Hall, D.D., LL.D., Burlington, Vt.	5 00	
	22.	Rev. George B. Johnson, Burlington, Vt.	5 00	
	22.	Prof. Edward Y. Hincks, D.D., Andover	5 00	
	23.	Old South Church, Boston	25 00	
	24.	Rev. W. H. Cobb, D.D., Newton Centre	5 00	
	27	Rev. W. Spooner Smith, Worcester	5 00	
	27.	Rt. Rev. John Scarborough, D.D., LL.D., Trenton, N. J.	10 00	
	28.	Mrs. George H. Corliss, Providence, R. I.	10 00	
		Received in February		$396 98
Mar.	2.	Rev. Francis N. Peloubet, D.D., Auburndale	$10 00	
	3.	Walter C. Brooks, Newton Centre	5 00	
	4.	Morris K. Jesup, New York, N. Y.	10 00	
	8.	Hon. James Schouler, LL.D., Boston	5 00	
	9.	Hon. Moses Giddings, Bangor, Me.	5 00	
	10.	Charles E. Ranlett, Auburndale	5 00	
	10.	Grace Church, New York, N. Y.	25 00	
	11.	J. D. R. Lamson, Toledo, O.	10 00	
	11.	Rt. Rev. Alexander H. Vinton, D.D., Springfield	10 00	
	11.	Mrs. William G. Benedict, Boston	10 00	
	11.	Rev. E. Blakeslee, D.D., Brookline	3 00	
	14.	Rev. D. Stuart Dodge, D.D., New York, N. Y.	20 00	
	15.	George Burnham, Sr., Philadelphia, Penn.	25 00	
	20.	Prof. W. F. Willcox, Ph.D., Ithaca, N. Y.	5 00	
	21.	Rev. Calvin B. Moody, Bristol, Conn.	2 00	
	21.	Rt. Rev. Frederick Burgess, D.D., Garden City, N. Y.	5 00	
	27.	Woman's Missionary Society, St. Ann's Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.	5 00	
	27.	Rev. S. P. Leeds, D.D., Hanover, N. H.	2 00	
	27.	Mrs. Israel Holmes, Waterbury, Conn.	5 00	
		Received in March		$167 00
Apr.	8.	Miss Martha C. Burgess, Dedham.	$5 00	
	13.	Hon. James Tillinghast, Providence, R. I.	10 00	
	20.	Rev. Walter Gwynne, Summit, N. J.	1 00	
	20.	Rathbone Gardner, Providence, R. I.	5 00	

Apr.	20.	Charles Morris Smith, Providence, R. I.	$10 00	
	24.	John Davis, Lincoln, Neb.,	50	
	24.	Pres. William J. Tucker, D.D., LL.D., Hanover, N. H.	10 00	
		Received in April		$41 50
May	3.	Rev. Cornelius H. Patton, D.D., Boston	$5 00	
	23.	Mrs. Samuel Colt, Hartford, Conn.	40 00	
	25.	Mrs. John S. Porter, Hartford, Conn.	25 00	
	29.	Prof. Lewis O. Brastow, D.D., New Haven, Conn.	5 00	
		Received in May		$75 00
June	7.	Grace Church, Providence, R. I.	$25 00	
	10.	George Ripley, Andover	10 00	
	10.	Hon. Samuel B. Capen, Boston	10 00	
	12.	Miss Alice Byington, Stockbridge	5 00	
	14.	Central Congregational Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.	5 00	
	20.	William P. Henzey, Philadelphia, Penn.	25 00	
	22.	Rt. Rev. W. N. McVickar, D.D., Providence, R. I.	10 00	
	23.	Samuel V. Hoffman, New York, N. Y.	25 00	
		Received in June		$115 00
July	8.	Mrs. Richard H. Dana, Cambridge	$5 00	
	10.	Rt. Rev. Leighton Coleman, D.D., LL.D., Wilmington, Del.	3 00	
	22.	Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., Worcester	10 00	
	24.	Ginn and Company, Boston	10 00	
	24.	Rev. Arthur Lawrence, D.D., Stockbridge	25 00	
	24.	St. John's Parish, Stamford, Conn.	28 15	
		Received in July		$81 15
Aug.	8.	William B. Taylor, Lynn	$5 00	
	12.	Mrs. Charles P. Turner, Philadelphia, Penn.	25 00	
	31.	Dr. William C. Rives, Washington, D. C.	5 00	
		Received in August		$35 00
Sept.	21.	William J. Breed, Cincinnati, O.	$5 00	
	21.	"M," Connecticut	8 00	
	22.	St. Anne's Church, Lowell	20 00	
	26.	Rev. Ernest J. Dennen, Lynn	5 00	
	28.	Hon. Robert H. Gardiner, Boston	5 00	
	28.	Rev. A. B. Hunter, Raleigh, N. C.	5 00	
		Received in September		$48 00
Oct.	5.	Mrs. Wallace H. Camp, Waterbury, Conn.	$50 00	
	7.	"A Vermont Lady"	50 00	
	7.	Hon. Frederick J. Kingsbury, LL.D., Waterbury, Conn.	25 00	
	12.	Mrs. George Westinghouse, Lenox	100 00	
	20.	Rt. Rev. Alexander Mackay-Smith, D.D., Philadelphia, Penn.	15 00	
	24.	Rev. J. H. Denison, D.D., Williamstown	10 00	

Oct.	30.	Hon. J. P. Bates, Brookline	$10 00	
	31.	Pres. W. F. P. Faunce, D.D., LL.D., Providence, R. I.	10 00	
	31.	Prof. C. R. Henderson, D.D., Chicago, Ill.	2 00	
	31.	Asylum Hill Congregational Church, Hartford, Conn.	25 00	
		Received in October		$297 00
Nov.	2.	Mrs. Gilman C. Hill, Waterbury, Conn.	$5 00	
	2.	Hon. Edward L. Pickard, Auburndale	20 00	
	3.	Rev. John G. Davenport, D.D., Waterbury, Conn.	10 00	
	4.	Congregational Church, Bath, N. H	5 25	
	9.	Morris K. Jesup, New York, N. Y.	10 00	
	14.	Mrs. A. S. Chase, Waterbury, Conn.	25 00	
	14.	Arthur C. Farley, Auburndale	5 00	
	14.	Mrs. John S. Brigham, Worcester	5 00	
	27.	William B. Herrick, Auburndale	10 00	
	27.	Mrs. David P. Kimball, Boston	25 00	
	27.	Mrs. Josiah Bradlee, Boston	10 00	
	28.	Hon. Richard H. Dana, Boston	10 00	
	28.	Rev. A. W. Hazen, D.D., Middletown, Conn.	5 00	
	28.	Arthur S. Johnson, Boston	10 00	
	30.	Rev. Thomas W. Nickerson, Pittsfield	10 00	
		Received in November		$165 25
Dec.	2.	Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, LL.D., New Haven, Conn.	$50 00	
	2.	Hon. Francis Lynde Stetson, LL.D., New York, N. Y.	30 00	
	2.	Prof. William North Rice, LL.D., Middletown, Conn.	5 00	
	2.	Everett O. Fisk, Boston	5 00	
	4.	Rev. Ozora S. Davis, Ph.D., New Britain, Conn.	2 00	
	5.	W. W. Lockwood, New York, N. Y.	5 00	
	6.	George Burnham, Jr., Philadelphia, Penn.	25 00	
	6.	Wolcott H. Johnson, Boston	25 00	
	8.	Rev. George L. Paine, Dorchester	5 00	
	8.	Trinity Church, Boston	25 00	
	8.	Prof. Austin B. Bassett, D.D., Hartford, Conn.	10 00	
	12.	St. Stephen's Parish, Providence, R. I.	10 00	
	12.	A. C. Tenney, Melrose	1 00	
	12.	Hon. Robert Treat Paine, Boston	5 00	
	12.	First Church, Newton Centre	10 00	
	12.	Rev. Morgan Dix, D.D., D.C.L., New York, N. Y.	10 00	
	12.	Hon. John E. Parsons, New York, N. Y.	25 00	
	12.	Hon. Robert D. Benedict, Brooklyn, N. Y.	10 00	
	12.	George A. Plimpton, New York, N. Y.	5 00	
	15.	Prof. Williston Walker, D.D., New Haven, Conn.	5 00	
	16.	Arthur Reed Kimball, Waterbury, Conn.	5 00	
	19.	Rev. E. E. Strong, D.D., Auburndale	3 00	
	21.	Pres. Henry Hopkins, D.D., LL.D., Williamstown	5 00	
	21.	Rev. J. Phelps Taylor, D.D., Andover	5 00	
	23.	Rev. James W. Bixler, D.D., New London, Conn.	10 00	

Dec.	23.	Rev. Frederick B. Allen, Boston	$5 00	
	25.	Rev. Parris T. Farwell, Wellesley Hills	5 00	
	25.	Center Congregational Church, Meriden, Conn.	5 00	
	29.	Rev. Amory H. Bradford, D.D., Montclair, N. J.	5 00	
	29.	Miss Edith Woolsey, New Haven, Conn.	5 00	
	29.	Church of the Ascension, New York, N. Y.	25 00	
	29.	James Hillhouse, New Haven, Conn.	10 00	
	29.	Pres. George Harris, D.D., LL.D., Amherst	15 00	
	29.	Rev. C. H. Spalding, D.D., Cambridge	5 00	
	30.	St. John's Church, Providence, R. I.	20 00	
	30.	Union Church, Providence, R. I.	10 00	
	30.	Dr. Lucien Howe, Buffalo, N. Y.	5 00	
	30.	B. V. French, Lynn	3 00	
	30.	Friends, Thompson, Conn.	10 00	
	30.	Rev. Charles G. Ames, Boston	5 00	
	30.	"A Friend," Boston	25 00	
	30.	Church Settlement Association of New Hampshire	5 00	
	30.	Mrs. Coolidge S. Roberts, Cambridge	20 00	
	31.	The Corresponding Secretary	56 69	
		Received in December		$535 69

Special Contributions for the Debt.

Feb.	15.	President Edward M. Gallaudet, LL.D., Washington, D.C.	$10 00	
Dec.	11.	Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., Worcester	10 00	
	15.	Hon. Seth Low, LL.D., New York, N. Y.	50 00	
	18.	President W. E. Huntington, LL.D., Newton Centre	7 50	
	18.	Rev. John Phelps Taylor, D.D., Andover	5 00	
	18.	Prof. Henry W. Farnam, R.P.D., New Haven, Conn.	25 00	
1906				
Jan.	9.	W. P. Henzey, Philadelphia, Penn.	25 00	
	9.	Miss Grace H. Dodge, New York, N. Y.	50 00	
	10.	J. D. R. Lamson, Toledo, O.	10 00	
	10.	Mrs. Frederick Billings, New York, N. Y.	50 00	
	10.	Rt. Rev. Alexander Mackay-Smith, D.D., Philadelphia, Penn.	15 00	
	10.	George Ripley, Andover	10 00	
	10.	Rev. John H. Denison, D.D., Williamstown	10 00	
	11.	Robert C. Ogden, New York, N. Y.	25 00	
	12.	Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., LL.D., Boston	25 00	
	13.	Rev. D. Stuart Dodge, D.D., New York, N. Y.	25 00	
	13.	Grace Church, Providence, R. I.	15 00	
	19.	George Burnham, Jr., Philadelphia, Penn.	25 00	
	20.	Rev. Thomas W. Thompson, Worcester	5 00	
	22.	Hon. Samuel B. Capen, Boston	5 00	
	31.	Prof. E. Y. Hincks, D.D., Andover	5 00	
		Total for Debt		$407 50

CONSTITUTION

OF THE

National League for the Protection of the Family

ARTICLE I. This association shall be called the NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE FAMILY.

ART. II. Its object shall be, through the improvement of public sentiment and legislation, to protect the institution of the Family, especially as affected by existing evils relating to Marriage and Divorce, and to secure its proper efficiency in individual and social life. It may co-operate with auxiliary or other bodies having similar aims in such ways as may be deemed expedient.

ART. III. It shall consist of the following persons, having power to fill vacancies and to add to their number. . . .

ART. IV. The officers of this society shall be a President, not more than five Vice-Presidents, a Recording Secretary, a Corresponding Secretary, a Treasurer, and an Executive Committee of not more than twelve persons, of which committee the Corresponding Secretary shall be a member, and of which not less than three shall constitute a quorum, having the duties indicated in their several offices, to be elected at the Annual Meeting, and to hold office until their successors are appointed.

ART. V. The LEAGUE shall hold its Annual Meeting on the third Wednesday in January, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman of the Executive Committee, and at such hour and place as shall be indicated in the call of the committee.

ART. VI. Amendments of this Constitution, of which due notice shall have been given in the call of any Annual Meeting, may be adopted at such meeting by the vote of two thirds of the members present.

ALL COMMUNICATIONS concerning the work of the LEAGUE and its general business should be addressed to the Corresponding Secretary, Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale, Mass.

CONTRIBUTIONS should be sent to the Treasurer, Mr. WOLCOTT H. JOHNSON, care of C. F. Hovey & Co., Boston.

FORM OF BEQUEST

I hereby give and bequeath to the NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE FAMILY, a corporation created by the Laws of the State of Connecticut, or its successor or assigns, the sum of.....dollars, the principal [or income, as may be desired] of which is to be used for the purposes for which said Corporation was chartered.